PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

From the

L'EKNA I	IONAL SEARCE	IING AUTH	URITY			
To: SIMORA A. LEVI-MINZI MCDERMOTT WILL & EMERY LLP				PCT		
201 SOUTH BISCAYNE BOULEVARD SUITE 2200)	WRITTEN OPINION OF THE INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY		
MIAMI, F	L 33131			INTERNATIO	ONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY	
•				(PCT Rule 43 <i>bis</i> .1)		
-				Date of mailing (day/month/year)		
Applicant's or agent's file reference				FOR FURTHER ACTION See paragraph 2 below		
068911.01	07 al application No	-	International filing date	(day/month/year)	Priority date (day/month/year)	
niteritation	ат аррпсацоп 140	•				
PCT/US05		ration (PC)	26 February 2005 (26.0 or both national classifications			
			•			
IPC(7): A6 Applicant	61 K 31/557, 31/1	2, 35/78 and	US Cl.: 424/778; 514/690	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		
			•			
METAPR	OTEOMICS, LLC	·		 		
1. This c	ppinion contains in	dications rel	ating to the following iten	ns:		
\boxtimes	Box No. I	Basis of the	e opinion			
	Box No. II	Priority	,	·		
	Box No. III	Non-establi	ishment of opinion with re	egard to novelty, inve	entive step and industrial applicability	
	Box No. ΓV	Lack of uni	ty of invention		·	
\boxtimes	Box No. V	Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability, citations and explanations supporting such statement				
	Box No. VI Certain documents cited					
\boxtimes	Box No. VII Certain defects in the international application					
	Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application					
2. FUR	THER ACTIO	N	•		·	
If a demand for international preliminary examination is made, this opinion will be considered to be a written opinion of the International Preliminary Examining Authority ("IPEA") except that this does not apply where the applicant chooses an Authority other than this one to be the IPEA and the chosen IPEA has notified the International Bureau under Rule 66.1bis(b) that written opinions of this International Searching Authority will not be so considered.						
If this opinion is, as provided above, considered to be a written opinion of the IPEA, the applicant is invited to submit to the IPEA a written reply together, where appropriate, with amendments, before the expiration of 3 months from the date of mailing of Form PCT/ISA/220 or before the expiration of 22 months from the priority date, whichever expires later.						
For further options, see Form PCT/ISA/220.						
3. For further details, see notes to Form PCT/ISA/220.						
Name and mailing address of the ISA/ US Authorized officer						
Name and mailing address of the ISA/ US Mail Stop PCT, Attn: ISA/US)	Y	A LOW - WALL	
Commissioner for Patents				Speeni Padmana	abhar ()	
P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450				Tolonkani Maria	1272 0600 / JJ7	
Facsimile No. (703) 305-3230				Telephone No. 5	W1-212-U0UU 0 -	
	ISA/237 (cover sh		2004)			

DOCKETED

RESPONSE TO RESPONSE TO PINION

DUE DATE 917/08

BAR DATE 917/08

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

International application No.

PCT/US05/06216

Box No	. I Basis of this opinion
	egard to the language, this opinion has been established on the basis of the international application in the language in which it led, unless otherwise indicated under this item.
	This opinion has been established on the basis of a translation from the original language into the following language, which is the language of a translation furnished for the purposes of international search (under Rules 12.3 and 23.1(b)).
	egard to any nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence disclosed in the international application and necessary to the claimed ion, this opinion has been established on the basis of:
a.	type of material
	a sequence listing
	table(s) related to the sequence listing
b.	format of material
	in written format
	in computer readable form
c.	time of filing/furnishing
	contained in international application as filed.
	filed together with the international application in computer readable form.
	furnished subsequently to this Authority for the purposes of search.
3.	In addition, in the case that more than one version or copy of a sequence listing and/or table relating thereto has been filed or furnished, the required statements that the information in the subsequent or additional copies is identical to that in the application as filed or does not go beyond the application as filed, as appropriate, were furnished.
4. Addit	onal comments:
	•
	•
orm PC	7/ISA/237/Box No. D. (January 2004)

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

International application No. PCT/US05/06216

Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43 bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement

1. Statement		
Novelty (N)	Claims 1-7	YES
	Claims NONE	NO
Inventive step (IS)	Claims NONE	YES
	Claims 1-7	NO
Industrial applicability (IA)	Claims 1-7	YES
	Claims NONE	NO

2. Citations and explanations:

The instant invention is drawn to a composition comprising a reduced isoalpha acid and isoalpha acid isolated from hops, and a method of reducing inflammation by administering said composition.

Claims 1-7 lack an inventive step under PCT Article 33(3) as being obvious over Kuhrts US 2002/0086070.

Kuhrts teaches a pharmaceutical composition comprising hops (Humulus lupus L) extract for treating inflammatory disorders such as osteoarthritis, rheumatoid arthritis. See column 2, paragraph [0014], [0016]. Kuhrts further teaches liquid carbon dioxide under supercritical conditions is a preferred extraction technique to obtain the components from the hops. See page 2, paragraphs [0016], and [0018]; page 6, claims 1-14.

Since Kuhrts teaches the same extract i.e., derived from hops obtained by the same process as recited by the instant claims and specification, Kuhrts hops extract will contain the components isoalpha acids and reduced isoalpha acids as recited by instant claims.

Kuhrts does not expressly teach the ratio of reduced isoalpha acid: isoalpha acid as about 3:1 to about 1:10 in the composition.

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to determine or optimize parameters such as effective amounts of the reduced isoalpha acid: isoalpha acid employed in the composition of Kuhrts, to obtain a desired effect such as reducing inflammation.

One having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have been motivated to determine the effective amounts of Iso-alpha acid and reduced isoalpha acid employed in the pharmaceutical compositions for methods of reducing inflammation in which the ratio of isoalpha acid: isoalpha acid is about 3:1 to about 1:10, since the optimization of effective amounts of known agents to be administered, is considered well in the competence level of an ordinary skilled artisan in pharmaceutical science, involving merely routine skill in the art.

Claim 7 lack an inventive step under PCT Article 33(3) as being obvious over Tobe et al. (5,604,263).

Tobe teaches a method of treating inflammatory disorder osteoporosis, comprising administering a pharmaceutical composition comprising an effective amount of one or more compounds selected from isohumolone, isocohumolone, and isoadhumulone of the instant claim 7 (Genus A). See abstract; column 2, structures (IV) to (VI); column 8, claim 1-4.

Tobe does not expressly teach the ratio of the two compounds as about 10:1 to about 1:10 in the composition.

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to optimize parameters such as effective amounts of the 10:1 to 1:10, to obtain a desired effect.

Claims 1-7 meet the criteria set out in PCT Article 33(4), and thus have industrial applicability because the subject matter claimed can be made or used in industry.

Form PCT/ISA/237 (Box No. V) (January 2004)

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

International application No.

PCT/US05/06216

Box	No.	VII	Certain	defects in	the international	application

The following defects in the form or contents of the international application	n have been noted:
Claims 5-6 are objected to under PCT Rule 66.2(a)(iii) as containing the following d should depend on Claim 4, and not Claim 1 as recited.	lefect(s) in the form or contents thereof: Claims 5-6
	. •

Form PCT/ISA/237 (Box No. VII) (January 2004)